

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

11 THERASENSE, INC., No. C04-02123 MJJ
12 Plaintiff, No. C04-03327 MJJ
No. C04-03732 MJJ
No. C05-03117 MJJ

14 BECTON, DICKINSON AND COMPANY,
15 Defendant.

**ORDER RE: PARTIES' REQUESTS TO
FILE DOCUMENTS UNDER SEAL**

17 Before the Court are the Defendants' various administrative motions to file documents under seal
18 in connection with their summary judgment motions. (Case No. 04-2123, Docket Nos. 374 & 379; Case
19 No. 04-3732, Docket Nos. 239 & 249; Case No. 05-3117, Docket Nos. 538, 548 and 554.)

20 To the extent these administrative motions seek to seal information in which the Defendants
21 themselves assert a confidentiality interest, the Court finds that Defendants have not made a detailed or
22 particularized showing as to which documents, or portions of documents, meet the “compelling reasons”
23 standard set forth in *Kamakana v. City of Honolulu*, 447 F.2d 1172 (9th Cir. 2006).

24 To the extent these administrative motions seek to seal information in which Plaintiffs assert a
25 confidentiality interest, the Court finds that Plaintiffs have failed to comply with Local Rule 79-5(d) by
26 either withdrawing the designation of confidentiality or filing a declaration establishing that documents,
27 or portions of documents, meet the “compelling reasons” set forth in *Kamakana*.

28 Moreover, it appears from an initial review that many, if not all, of the sealing requests are overbroad, as in some instances they broadly seek to place entire documents under seal, portions of

1 which the Court can perceive no legitimate confidentiality interest by any party.

2 Accordingly, the Court orders the parties, after meeting-and-conferring regarding the pending
3 administrative motions, to file supplemental papers **no later than Friday, November 9, 2007** that either
4 (1) withdraw confidentiality designations and the associated sealing requests, or (2) adequately establish,
5 by sworn declaration, the particularized and specific grounds on which this Court should seal
6 documents, or portions of documents, under the standards set forth in *Kamakana*. The Court will enter
7 a final ruling on any outstanding requests for protective seals in connection with the summary judgment
8 motions after receiving the parties' supplemental submissions.

9 For all future requests for protective seals, the Court refers the parties to, and **ORDERS** the
10 parties to comply with, this Court's September 2007 Standing Order For Cases Involving Sealed Or
11 Confidential Documents.

12
13 **IT IS SO ORDERED.**

14
15
16 Dated: November 5, 2007
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28



MARTIN J. JENKINS
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE